

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
AUSTIN DIVISION

DOUGLAS RAMSEY,
Plaintiff

v.

SHEET PILE LLC,
Defendant

§
§
§
§
§
§
§

No. 1:21-CV-00331-DH

ORDER

Before the Court is Defendant/Counter-Plaintiff Sheet Pile's Motion to Compel Lone Star Global LLC's Responses to Subpoena to Produce Documents and Information, Dkt. 83. After considering the motion, all related filings, and argument made at the hearing on the motion, the Court finds that the order should be granted in part and denied in part, as follows.

The Court **ORDERS** with respect to:

Lone Star's "General Objections" asserted in its response to Sheet Pile's RFPs (see Dkt. 83-3, at 3): The Court **OVERRULES** these objections. At the hearing, counsel for Lone Star indicated that no documents were withheld pursuant solely to these general objections; accordingly, the Court does not order Lone Star to produce any documents pursuant to the overruling of these objections.

RFP 1: The Court **SUSTAINS** Lone Star's objections to this RFP and **DENIES** Sheet Pile's motion to compel further response(s) to this request.

RFP 3: The Court **SUSTAINS** Lone Star's objections to this RFP and **DENIES** Sheet Pile's motion to compel further response(s) to this request.

RFP 5: The Court **SUSTAINS** Lone Star's objections to this RFP and **DENIES** Sheet Pile's motion to compel further response(s) to this request.

RFP 9: At the hearing, counsel for Lone Star withdrew his objection to this request. The Court, therefore, considers Sheet Pile's motion on RFP 9 to be **MOOT**.

RFPs 11 & 12: The Court **OVERRRULES IN PART** and **SUSTAINS IN PART** Lone Star's objections and therefore **GRANTS IN PART AND DENIES IN PART** Sheet Pile's motion with respect to RFPs 11 and 12. In particular, the Court **ORDERS** Lone Star to respond to RFPs 11 and 12 in full, except that Lone Star may redact any confidential pricing information contained within any production responsive to these requests.

As discussed at the hearing, the parties' agreed protective order, Dkt. 18, applies to Lone Star's production ordered here. To the extent Lone Star has confidentiality concerns, it may invoke the procedures and protections set out in that order. The morning of the hearing, non-party Eastlink Capital Management, LLC, d/b/a Steelwall US, filed a motion for protective order expressing concerns about documents that Lone Star may be ordered to produce pursuant to this order that might include Steelwall's confidential or trade-secret information. At the hearing, the parties agreed to confer and provide the Court with an agreed protective order that would extend to Steelwall. Once the parties have filed the proposed order, the undersigned will enter it, disposing of Steelwall's motions for protective order found at Dkts. 91 and 93.

SIGNED January 20, 2023.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Dustin M. Howell', is written above a horizontal line.

DUSTIN M. HOWELL
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE